

REMARKS

Claim 1-46 were pending in this application, of which claims 15-45 had been withdrawn from consideration. New claims 47 and 48 have been added and claims 1 and 5 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

Drawing Objections

The drawings have been objected to under 37 C.F.R. 1.83(a) as not showing every feature of the invention specified in the claims. These objections are respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. However, Figures 4 and 5 have been replaced to further prosecution of this application. The support for the new figures is found in the Detailed Description section of the present application (page 21, line 15 to page 22, line 7) and original Figures 4 and 5. The new Figures 4 and 5 illustrate different views of the structures shown in the original Figures 4 and 5 and described in the Detailed Description, as well as the test substrate, as claimed in the original claim 1. In addition, Figure 3 is submitted because it is now on a separate page. No new matter has been added.

Abstract Objections

The abstract of the disclosure has been objected to. A replacement abstract is supplied herein.

Amendments to the Specification

The Specification has been amended to refer to new Figures 4 and 5. Additional amendments have been made to further incorporate the material from the original claims 1, 6, 7, and 14. No new matter has been added.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 112

Claims 1-14 and 46 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. This rejection is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

The Examiner has stated that "it is unclear and not clearly understood as to: in what respect the two coils have different winding distributions, how the relative current directions are being switched, what is a test substrate...." The Applicants respectfully disagree.

The winding distributions are discussed in the Specification at least on page 16, line 24 (in connection with Figure 2) through page 17, line 28. Methods for biasing the magnetic field are taught in the same section.

The original claim 1 states that the test circuit is used to test the response of the test substrate to the imposed magnetic field, and the test substrate, in turn, is the material being tested. Furthermore, windings and discrete concentric loops are described in the Specification at least on page 26, line 6 through page 28, line 15.

Therefore, all elements of all pending claims have been described in the Specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to make and/or use the invention.

Claims 1-14 and 46 have also been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. This rejection is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

As discussed above, all elements of all pending claims have been fully defined and described in the original specification in such a way as to be understood by one of ordinary skill in the art.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that all claims are in condition for allowance, and it is respectfully requested that the application be passed to issue. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.

By 

James M. Smith

Registration No. 28,043

Telephone: (978) 341-0036

Facsimile: (978) 341-0136

Concord, MA 01742-9133

Dated: 12/12/3